



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,260	08/18/2003	Kazuyuki Okamura	030829	1526
23850	7590	04/04/2005		EXAMINER
				ROBINSON, MARK A
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2872	

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/642,260	OKAMURA ET AL. <i>(SM)</i>
	Examiner Mark A. Robinson	Art Unit 2872

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/18/03
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 2872

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of group I (claims 2-7 along with linking claim 1) in the reply filed on 2/14/05 is acknowledged. Claims 8-10 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected subject matter.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: "preferably," as used after the claimed range, makes it unclear if applicant intends the claim to be limited to the range or the specific value in the range. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2872

4. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koetke (US 5760952).

Koetke shows an operation microscope including an observation system with objective lens(3), an illumination system(7), and a deflection means, wherein the deflection means includes a pair of deflection members(1,2) guiding light at equal predetermined angles with respect to the optical axis (see fig. 7) and being disposed on opposite sides of the optical axis so as to sandwich the optical axis(5) of the observation system therebetween (shown in fig. 7). Note that one deflection member is between the illumination system and the optical axis and the other is on an opposite side of the optical axis so as to sandwich the optical axis therebetween.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2872

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koetke (US 5760952).

Koetke shows an angle of one of the beams deflected by a deflection member to be within the claimed range, but does not teach both of the deflection angles to be within this range. However, these angles will depend upon the working distance of the microscope. Larger working distances which result in small deflection angles such as those claimed are well known and desirable for surgical applications. It would have been obvious to the ordinarily skilled artisan at the time of invention to change these deflection angles in Koetke's microscope in order to provide an increased working distance for the microscope.

7. Claims 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koetke (US 5760952) in view of Kaneko (US 5627613).

Koetke appears to show in fig. 2A a third deflection member(1b) guiding light at a larger angle than the other deflection members (note the portion of light deflected from member 1b and passing member 1a), but it is not clear if this deflected light is actually reaching the eye to be operated on.

However, Kaneko shows a third deflection member(9/10) which guides a portion of light at a larger angle than the other

Art Unit: 2872

deflection members in fig. 4. It would have been obvious to the ordinarily skilled artisan at the time of invention to include a third deflection member in Koetke's device in order to provide for more oblique illumination as taught by Kaneko.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 5 and 6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art does not teach an operation microscope which further comprises the emitting region adjusting means arrangement as set forth in the combination of claim 5.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to Biber, Dèverin, Sander, Geschwentner, and Takagi all show microscopes with deflection members, some of which sandwich the optical axis therebetween.

Art Unit: 2872

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Robinson whose telephone number is (571) 272-2319.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew Dunn, can be reached at (571) 272-2312. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MR

4/1/05


MARK A. ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER